Remarks

In the present response, claims 1 – 12 and 20 – 21 are canceled, and claims 22 – 26 are newly presented. Claims 13 – 19 and 22 – 26 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 102(e)

Claims 13, 15, 16, and 18-21 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by US publication number 2002/0107971 (Bailey). These rejections are traversed.

Claims 13, 15, 16, and 18-21 recite elements not taught or even suggested in Bailey. Some examples are provided below for independent claim 13.

As one example, independent claim 13 recites program code that defines a usage policy that assigns a priority to the incoming transaction based on the data in the meta data field and that assigns priorities to outgoing transactions; and overrides the priority based on the data in the meta data field with the requested priority included in the priority field of the incoming transaction. Bailey does not teach or suggest these elements.

Bailey generally teaches that content is delivered based on quality of service, QoS, data (see paragraph [0082]). Nowhere does Bailey teach or even suggest that the QoS data overrides a priority based on data in a meta data field with a requested priority that was included in a priority field of the incoming transaction.

For at least these reasons, the rejected claims are not anticipated by Bailey.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 14 and 17 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US publication number 2002/0107971 (Bailey) in view of USPN 6,988,133 (Zavalkovsky). These rejections are traversed.

As explained above, independent claim 13 recites elements not taught or suggested in Bailey. Zavalkovsky fails to cure these deficiencies. For at least the reasons given with respect to independent claim 13, dependent claims 14 and 17 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
3404 E. Harmony Road
Mail Stop 35
Fort Collins, CO 80528

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 832-236-5529